When Libertarianism meets Authoritarianism

Jonas Nilsson

When Libertarianism meets Authoritarianism - The Union of Fascism and Anarchy

Jonas Nilsson

Abstract: This investigative study aims to create an understanding of why two seemingly diametrically opposed political perspectives can converge, through two prominent opinion leaders, in their explicit support for the same presidential candidate. The analysis is based on three different policy areas of Trump's 2016 presidential candidacy, and how Richard Spencer and Stefan Molyneux relate to them. Spencer is a leading figure of the American alt-right, and Molyneux is a political commentator for voluntarism and anarcho-capitalism. Both fully support Trump's policy directions, but their support is motivated differently based on their respective theoretical standpoints. Nevertheless, there are clear points of union that bind them together, giving rise to what could be referred to as anarcho-fascism.

1. Introduction

This thesis analyzes how it is possible that two prominent opinion leaders from seemingly two diametrically opposed political ideologies, libertarian and authoritarian, can converge in their explicit support for the same presidential candidate.

1.1 Background

When Donald Trump announced his candidacy for the presidency, many media outlets and political experts were skeptical about Trump's chances of winning the Republican Party's presidential nomination. Furthermore, at the initial stage of Trump's campaign, it was highly unclear who would constitute his voter base. Attacks from his own party suggested that Trump was not politically conservative and therefore could not attract the core voters of the Republican Party within the Christian conservative right.

As Trump gained successes and eventually became the Republican presidential candidate, his voter base, consisting mainly of white men, crystallized. The strongest voter group that almost exclusively supports Trump can be referred to the category of authoritarianism (MacWilliams 2016). Authoritarians are characterized by their attraction to wanting a strong leader, especially if there is a perceived threat. This results in a strong centralization of possible government authority, where it is the one in charge who makes the decisions, which in turn risks resulting in limited individual freedom.

In stark contrast to the authoritarians, prominent libertarians and large parts of the libertarian movement have also joined the Trump train. That is, adherents of a political movement that, unlike the authoritarians, instead desire a minimal state and freedom from coercion. A Hobbesian ideological tradition merges with a Lockean one.

This goes against the expected understanding of how these two ideological streams should act as their opposites – as two poles. This schizophrenic tendency observed within the political diversity that supports Trump has also been pointed out earlier by prominent Democrats regarding the Republican Party. Democrat Daniel Patrick Moynihan expressed it this way: "The American people preferred a president who talks like Thomas Jefferson, but governs like Alexander Hamilton. Where Jefferson represented a rebellious individualism and limited government influence, Hamilton advocated for a stronger centralized power apparatus" (Moynihan quoted in Gelin 2012:15).

The significant difference with Trump and within the Republican Party is that these two streams previously stood in contrast to each other internally, as the nomination process stood between two candidates for respective direction. Barry Goldwater against Nelson Rockefeller in the 60s is one example, another is Ronald Reagan against Bob Dole in the 80s, but it has not resulted in a joint support for a common candidate (Gelin 2012:15).

1.2 Scientific Problem

There thus exists a political theoretical anomaly where those who desire maximal authority at the expense of freedom and those who desire minimal authority for the attainment of freedom actively support the same candidate. This goes against the preconceived understanding of how adherents of respective political theory should act.

A scientific problem begins with the need to explain or understand something, and an explanatory situation occurs first when a statement is made that goes against the preconceived understanding of what should have happened. If an event has a high probability of occurring, there is nothing to demonstrate, except possibly an art exhibition in the ability to kick open open doors. It thus becomes interesting to seek an explanation and understanding of strong events that have a low probability of occurring (Hyldgaard 2008:136). Hence, Trump becomes interesting as he managed to win the American presidential election against all odds, supported by adherents of ideological streams, authoritarianism and libertarianism, that otherwise, usually, are in polemic with each other.

When the belief in regularity is broken by a so-called black swan – such as when these two seemingly opposing ideological streams unite in the same candidacy, research truly begins.

1.3 Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this thesis is not to analyze Trump or his campaign, but rather to investigate how two seemingly fundamentally distinct perspectives can coexist, at least temporarily. The aim is, through an idea analysis, to examine two political streams, a heritage from Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and John Locke (1632-1704). By adopting the authoritarian and liberal ideological traditions, it increases the possibility of exploring the aspects that bring these distinct perspectives together.

Political ideas and theories transition from the abstract to the practical when they shape and influence people's lives, which in turn significantly impacts societal development as a whole (Beckman 2005:9). All people live by a philosophy, whether we are aware of it or not, and whether we want to or not. It determines our view of ourselves and our world and is the instrument we use for our decisions.

Political theory/philosophy has always preceded social upheaval. How social norms are formed and changed, and how governance should be structured, rests on a philosophical foundation of the political. Therefore, it is of significant importance to constantly analyze and critically examine the political and what it is constituted of (Beckman 2005:7).

While it is politicians who win general elections, it is philosophers and ideologues who lay the foundation in the general perception of what is right and wrong, and this in turn affects politicians and the political (Beckman 2005:7).

For a deeper and more generalizable understanding of the research question, the problem is elevated within the abstraction ladder to also see what lies within the political explanatory models that allow their respective adherents to cooperate with each other and even enthusiastically support the same presidential candidate. This creates an intra-scientific relevance to this thesis study as previous research has emphasized these two ideological traditions as opposites that exclude each other – where, for example, freedom is set against security.

The purpose of the thesis is thus to provide a deeper understanding of how it is possible for these ideological streams to cooperate. To also understand why, the investigation will be set in the contemporary context with Trump. This allows the identification of political expressions from the actors based on their respective philosophical ideas about the political.

The research question thus becomes: How can the paradoxical convergence of the two diametrically opposed ideological streams of the authoritarian and the libertarian to Trump's presidential candidacy be understood?

1.4 Previous Research

This study is about how two different ideological streams, the libertarian and the authoritarian, have converged through adherents of each tradition explicitly supporting the same presidential candidacy.

A clear emphasis within previous political science research has been how these two traditions have been set against each other – freedom sacrificed for security and vice versa. Therefore, this section will first address the previous research that places the traditions in opposition. Since Trump's policy proposal regarding the ban on Muslim entry is an extension of the American war on terrorism, and since this policy will also be one of the starting points for this study's analysis, that starting point also fits well for the previous research.

This thesis further draws its theoretical framework from Carl Schmitt and Ayn Rand. As there is no previous research, to my knowledge, that connects Schmitt with Rand, an account will instead be given of the existing research on each political theorist.

"Law governs the state or the state governs the law" could be one of the many research starting points for how these two ideological streams are set against each other. There is an emphasis on this starting point within previous research regarding the American administration and its actions in the "war on terrorism."

Claudia Aradau highlights this dilemma in her scientific article: "Forget Equality? Security and Liberty in the 'War on Terror.'" She argues that the war on terrorism has become a clear subject for public and political debate about freedom versus security. According to Aradau, there is a trade-off between the importance of security and the individual rights of the people (Aradau 2008:293).

Aradau attributes the development to the favor of the Hobbesian camp and expresses it as follows: "Freedoms do not only need to give way to security imperatives, security becomes a necessary step in the preservation of freedom" (Aradau 2008:296).

According to Aradau, the restrictions on freedom can occur because it is not the entire population that is restricted; the restrictions on freedom only affect a few. The majority agrees to the individual's restrictions because they themselves, according to Aradau, have nothing to hide: "People may be ready to put up with restrictions on liberties because they are given reason to expect that, as 'good' citizens, they will in any case not be affected" (Aradau 2008:297).

Critics, including civil rights organizations, argue that everyone, regardless of origin or citizenship, has an inalienable right that the state should not be able to violate – such as the right to habeas corpus, freedom from arbitrary detention (Aradau 2008:295).

Nathaniel Branden points out in his scientific article on Ayn Rand's philosophy that she was a champion of individual rights. Her philosophy was based on the right to one's own life as an end in itself, and she was therefore an advocate for total political and economic freedom (Branden 1984:43).

Branden further argues that Rand was often misunderstood and attributed misinterpretations of her extremely libertarian philosophy, such as that humans would be beasts that survive total freedom by either "eating or being eaten" (Branden 1984:43). This led opponents on the left to slander her as a fascist (Branden 1984:43). This is entirely incorrect, according to Branden, as she was an advocate for a free market economy, in the absolute sense, meaning without any state intervention (Branden 1984:44).

Branden's position receives some pushback from Jennifer Burns, who instead argues that Rand can be difficult to place due to her originality. Burns categorizes her as a romantic form of realism and to some extent also towards social Darwinism (Burns 2009:4-5). Thus, she is also linked with the philosopher of power, Nietzsche, and Burns argues that Rand reworked Nietzsche's philosophy of power and placed it within the American right's intellectual sphere (Krueckeberg 2011:111-112).

Craig Biddle, on the other hand, clearly places Rand within the Lockean tradition of freedom with the limited moral state as a goal. However, her clearest criticism of Locke was, according to Biddle, that he attributed man's, according to Rand, natural rights to

life, freedom, and property as God-given: "With all due respect to Locke and the Founders (and the respect due is monumental), the idea that rights come from God or from a law of nature created by God ... fails to meet the requirement of demonstrability" (Biddle 2011:19-20).

According to Jennifer Burns, Rand should be understood from the historical context she comes from, i.e., as a refugee from the collectivist Soviet Union, and her philosophy should be understood as a strong reaction against the totalitarian nature of communism (Burns 2009:2-3). Rand's anti-communist and philosophical vision of freedom made her, according to Burns, a symbiosis with the American right.

Rand left behind, according to Burns, a double-edged philosophical legacy. First, something Burns attributes as a cult-like sectarian following of Rand's named libertarian philosophy – objectivism. On the other side of the blade is the justification for the limited state based on a libertarian economic and political system. Thus, she has, according to Burns, influenced and affected both the libertarian movement and the American right as a whole.

Schmitt's political theory and his conceptualization of the sovereign and authority, along with his ideas about the exception, have received a revival in connection with the US-initiated war on terrorism (Benoist 2013:28). Some political scientists, including Professor Levinson at the University of Texas, have even gone so far as to claim that the Bush administration was directly inspired by Schmitt's political thinking (Benoist 2013:13).

According to Benoist, based on Schmitt's political conceptualization, the Bush administration started a total war in a religious sense. There is no legitimate enemy to negotiate with to make peace; there is only the pursuit of eradication (Benoist 2013:31). Benoist describes the development and result as a policing process of the military, with the noted difference that police work never ceases but is constantly active in its authority (Benoist 2013:26).

Schmitt has also been revived in American domestic politics through Roxanne Lynn Doty's scientific article on the libertarian American system that allows the formation and organization of armed militia groups. This has practically meant, according to Lynn Doty, the possibility for actors other than the sovereign (the almighty legislator) to decide whether there is a state of normalcy or a need for the introduction of an exception (Lynn Doty 2007:113).

According to Lynn Doty, this challenges Schmitt's conceptualization of the sovereign and the political. "Evidence from this case suggests that we should not limit our understanding of decisions that result in contemporary manifestations of exceptionalism to those controlled by the state or elites. Rather, decisions can arise in

numerous locales and can be made by seemingly insignificant agents" (Lynn Doty 2007:113).

This receives some support from Neocleous's study, where he argues that Schmitt misses the social aspect of the political. The civil discourse is completely subordinated to the state (Neocleous 1996:59). Neocleous labels Schmitt as a fascist ideologue and attributes him as the Hobbes of the 20th century, with Schmitt's defense of the idea that everything should be subordinated to the total state (Neocleous 1996:48). In this respect, Neocleous places Schmitt in a diametrical opposition to Foucault, who instead argued that state power is subordinated to the social body. However, according to Neocleous, they are united in their view of the ever-present conflict and the risk of war – in Foucault's case within the social, and in Schmitt's within the political.

2. Method and Materials

This chapter will first clarify the methodological basis of idea analysis, which explains how the empirical implementation can be interpreted. The chapter concludes with an account of the material that will form the basis for the analysis.

2.1 Idea Analysis

To answer the research question, an idea analysis will be conducted. By idea analysis, the scientific study of the political is meant (Beckman 2005:11-12). The emphasis in idea analysis is mainly on what it examines, not directly how (Beckman 2005:12). The idea-centered analysis will help us clarify the political-philosophical question (Beckman 2005:19) that this study aims to answer.

The thesis can be characterized as an idea-analytical study since it will primarily address the idea-centered level through the two theoretical frameworks applied to the nature of governance. By clarifying the central concepts of the theories, the ideas and fundamentals that characterize each framework are refined. This will clarify their meaning (Beckman 2005:28). The theories become the utopian, an extreme image without an exact counterpart in reality, and the tool applied to the empirical to answer the research question (Ibid).

The theoretical framework will highlight the essential differences between the political theories and provide the basis for relating the central concepts to the empirical data. For the analysis to be meaningful, the concepts and terms must be clearly clarified and defined (Beckman 2005:31). Through definition, the concepts gain both meaning and ideological content (Beckman 2005:33). The results are then placed in the contemporary context to fully create an explanatory understanding from the actors of how their respective ideological streams converge in Trump. This is done through an analysis of their own presentations, which will provide the descriptive answer to why

they campaign for Trump and allow for interpreting the political message from the theoretical perspective (Beckman 2005:14).

For the idea analysis to be meaningful, it requires a high degree of interpretive freedom, allowing for creativity and the ability to explore in the analysis (Beckman 2005:28,98). However, to ensure intersubjective reliability, illustrative quotes from the empirical material will be used as the basis for interpretation, increasing the reliability of the idea analysis results.

2.2 Materials

The two actors that the thesis focuses on in the subsequent analysis are Stefan Molyneux from Freedomain Radio and Richard Spencer from Radix Radio.

Freedomain Radio is one of the world's largest media with a philosophical focus on freedom issues. The creator, philosopher, and historian of ideas, Molyneux, is politically oriented towards voluntarism and anarcho-capitalism. He partly bases his ideological foundation on Ayn Rand, who is also a declared role model for Molyneux.

Richard Spencer is one of the leading figures in the newly emerged American "alt-right" movement, which in Swedish terms would be referred to as part of the national movement. Spencer has a pronounced extreme right-wing profile and fully shares the political view with Carl Schmitt's conceptualization of the political.

The material will consist of radio episodes from Freedomain Radio and Radix Radio. The collected material has been limited in time from the Republican Party's nomination process to the end of 2016. The selection of material has also been limited to the radio episodes that address Trump's policy proposals according to the operationalization below. The episodes that the analysis has been based on are the following:

- Freedomain Radio, episodes no: 3146 (2015-12-09), 3149 (2015-12-12), 3434 (2016-10-03), 3459 (2016-10-18), 3473 (2016-10-29).
- Radix Radio, episodes: Trump, Islam, and Civilization (2015-12-09), Trump, Putin, and the Future of the White World (2015-12-19), Trump, Year 1 (2016-07-10), Crunch Time for Immigration Restriction (2016-12-01).

2.3 Operationalization

The starting point for the analysis will be three of Trump's clear policy proposals and statements that set him apart from the other presidential candidates. These three will be:

1. The total ban on Muslim entry.
2. Geopolitical stance.
3. Immigration policy.

The choice of the three areas was based partly on the clear distinction from the other candidates, but also because each area particularly touches on a field within the political theoretical. The first point of the entry ban creates an understanding of the law, the geopolitical stance on how one understands oneself in relation to others, and immigration, which shapes the view of who constitutes the nation and who gets to be part of it.

The support of the two actors, Molyneux and Spencer, will first be presented descriptively and then, based on the political theoretical framework, the description will be interpreted to locate the unifying touchpoints.

When quoting and referring to more direct and concrete comments from Spencer and Molyneux, these will be referenced to an exact time from the radio program. Otherwise, the episodes will be referenced in their entirety.

3. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework will be based on an authoritarian and a liberal ideological tradition. First, the authoritarian theory will be clarified through Carl Schmitt, often referred to as the Hobbes of the 20th century (Schwab 2005

), with his conceptualization of the political. The section is followed by a review of the Lockean libertarian tradition, where the individual's right to life, liberty, and property is in focus, which gave rise to the American Constitution and from which one of libertarianism's great thinkers, Ayn Rand, takes her departure (Biddle 2011:20).

The two political theorists, Schmitt (1888-1985) and Rand (1905-1982), were contemporaries and have left a significant mark on their respective ideologies. Both sections take their starting point from how Schmitt and Rand view human "nature," which in turn gives rise to how norms and institutions should be designed.

3.1 The Authoritarian through Schmitt

In political theory, it is usually taken as a starting point whether humans are fundamentally considered good or evil. All political theorizing can be traced, either implicitly or explicitly, to this grouping (Schmitt 2010:76, Schmitt 2005:56). It becomes an anthropological starting point, where the universally human determines which norms and institutions should exist for the human way of life (Heidegren 2012:127). This in turn leads to the legitimization of legal norms, authority, and the monopoly on violence. According to Schmitt, human universal rights are only recognized if one can defend one's rights. In political science terms, the fundamental existence of "rights" means that people can secure a geographically defined area and have the ability to defend it. Only then can any rights be provided, and resources created and distributed (Wittrock 2012:69).

Schmitt undeniably attributes evil to humans. But not in a moral sense. He instead formulates it as humans being either dangerous or harmless, risky or innocuous (Schmitt 2010:76), which becomes the difference between authoritarian and liberal theories (Heidegren 2012:130). Schmitt sees humans as unpredictable and incalculable, and thus also dangerous (Heidegren 2012:130). This gives rise to the need for the authoritarian. If humans were instead calculable, harmless, and innocuous, the political would be redundant (Heidegren 2012:131). The assumption about human nature means that Schmitt's political conceptualization is independent of both time and space. Humans are deceitful by nature, a lukewarm friend (Heidegren 2012:130). If humans were instead constant and thus predictable, they would be considered harmless even if the constant state were hostile (Heidegren 2012:130).

Schmitt agrees with Hobbes in this respect, that the human "state of nature" is problematic. Without Leviathan, there is a war of all against all. War thus precedes the political, which turns Carl von Clausewitz's (1780-1831) famous maxim about war as a continuation of politics by other means on its head. According to Hobbes' idea, politics is instead a continuation of war by other means. Schmitt shares the same view of the political, defining politics based on conflict. Schmitt formulates it as all politics being constituted by a friend-enemy distinction.

A clear distinction is made, however, between the private enemy and the public enemy. According to Schmitt, the private enemy consists of a dispute that can be traced to the moral, it is an enemy within one's own group, someone the individual can/should turn the other cheek to (Schmitt 2010:49). The political enemy, on the other hand, consists of a grouping in conflict with one's own political entity. A fighting group against another fighting group, thus the friend-enemy distinction should be understood literally and not as an abstraction (Schmitt 2010:47-48). The ultimate consequence of the political is thus what we find in war or revolution (Schmitt 2010:50).

The political cannot be understood if one's own entity does not know who will be affected or should be fought. The political thus has not only a linguistic connection to the polemical, but it is also actual (Schmitt 2010:50-51). The political is constituted by the friend-enemy distinction, which serves as a criterion and not a substantive definition (Schmitt 2010:46). The distinction can be understood from other independent antitheses that cannot be further traced, such as good and evil in the moral sphere or beautiful and ugly in the aesthetic sphere (Schmitt 2010:46).

However, the political enemy need not be either evil or ugly but can simply be "the other" or "the stranger," whose nature involves a negation to one's own way of life. This in turn can lead to an existential conflict, an enemy that needs to be defeated to preserve one's own way of life (Schmitt 2010:46-47).

The political extends not only to a particular area but moves across all areas. If something is considered apolitical, it is precisely because of a political, implicit or explicit, decision (Schmitt 2005:2). Everything is thus subject to authority and the political. It is instead the degree of intensity of the conflict that determines whether an area/subject is politicized or not (Heidegren 2012:131). The belief that humanity's conflictual existence will resolve itself is nothing but an expression of a naive and optimistic, and according to Schmitt, incorrect, view of human nature (Heidegren 2012:137).

The conflictual struggle that constitutes the political should not be viewed as a sports-like contest, such as wrestling, but rather as a martial one. The insight into politics lies within the framework of understanding that it is violence that constitutes the struggle, where the actual possibility of killing lies (Schmitt 2010:52). In this respect, every political decision rests on a bullet waiting to be fired if the enemy resists. War and annihilation become the most extreme potential consequence of such enmity (Schmitt 2010:52). The political thus becomes the relationship to the insight of the actual possibility of war (Schmitt 2010:56).

Enmity can be categorized into three parts: the conventional, the real, and the absolute enemy. The conventional enemy can be viewed from the perspective of limited war; the enemy does not threaten one's way of life and thus does not pose an existential threat. The real enemy, on the other hand, threatens not the physical existence of the friendly grouping but its form of existence (way of life). The absolute enemy, however, threatens both and must therefore be annihilated (Wittrock 2012:66).

Schmitt makes an analogy to the religious to fully understand the political and the absolute enemy. He argues that all modern political theory is an expression of secularized religion (Schmitt 2005:36).

The constituted enmity of politics can thus be understood within the framework of the religious, such as the struggle between the faithful and the sinners (Schwab 2005). Schmitt's state theory can not only be further understood in religious terms but also systematically aligns with it (Schmitt 2005:36). The almighty God is replaced by the almighty legislator, the sovereign. To identify the sovereign, it is enough to determine who decides when an exception should be made. The sovereign is thus both within and outside the legal order at the same time (Schmitt 2005:7), and when an exception is decided, it is comparable to the religious miracle. That is, when something happens that theoretically "cannot" happen according to the legal order but must inevitably happen. It becomes the divine power that saves an otherwise hopeless situation from the perspective of the legal order (Schmitt 2005:38).

It is the divine power, the sovereign, that gives rise to law and security, and not some universal "truth" found in nature (Strong 2005).

The exception itself is not an exception to the political but is part of its nature (Schmitt 2005:5). For the same reason that the religious cannot be upheld without divine intervention, neither can the political be maintained if the possibility of the exception is eliminated.

The law, the legal, ultimately rests not on the norm but on the exception; in other words, on the decision or ruling that allows the law to be upheld. Schmitt argues that it is impossible for a legal order to foresee every event, making it impossible for it to be all-encompassing. Since unforeseen situations will inevitably arise, which in turn must be handled outside the normal (Strong 2005). The existence of the state rests on its self-preserving action, thereby ensuring the maintenance of law and order, even if it is at the expense of the law. The state will persist even if the law is temporarily deviated from (Schmitt 2005:12).

It is ultimately the sovereign alone who makes the decision on the exception. Once the sovereign has delivered a decision, it is, like the church, impossible to appeal (Schmitt 2005:55). The exercise of authority is absolute and, like religion, is also infallible (Schmitt 2005:55). Schmitt formulates it as "Autoritas, non veritas facit legem," which means that the authority's decision is prioritized above everything else (Schmitt 2005:52).

3.2 The Liberal through Rand

The Aristotelian definition of the political is the organization to execute and implement ideas together as a unit. Humans are political animals, and what distinguishes humans from other political animals, like bees and ants, is the ability to make rational choices. The distinction between humans and animals is reason, which brings the concept of free will. It is in human self-interest to be rational, to be able to cooperate with others to develop and survive to the best of their ability (Rand 1961:14-15). Therefore, according to Rand, humans can be considered “good” based on rationality.

Since humans are free to choose, they can also choose to be irrational and thus become “evil” (Rand 1961:14). The primary purpose of the state, in this context, is to ensure that the negative consequences of irrational people's choices affect only themselves and do not impact rational people. The state should not strive to prohibit irrationality but only ensure that people are free to choose their own path and reap the fruits of their labor.

An individual has a right to their own life, chooses their own path according to their rational ability, and for an individual to think and live as they wish, Rand argues that a political system based on total freedom is required (Bernstein 2009:7).

The political can be viewed as a system based on voluntarism, not only towards each other as citizens but also from citizens towards the state and authority. This lays the

foundation for the moral state, whose authority is based on the citizens' own consent (Rand 1963a:109).

According to Rand, there is only one moral truth, and it is connected to the objectively real. Philosophy and morality are thereby comparable to mathematics and science, where there can be only one correct answer (Bernstein 2009:53). Truth and morality are therefore to be regarded as objectively verifiable (Bernstein 2009:58), based on facts and not on beliefs, feelings, or opinions. Thus, according to Rand, truth is not a social construction, something experienced, formed, and created by society (Bernstein 2009:60).

Morality is derived from the human, its nature, and is therefore universally valid (Bernstein 2009:62). The only moral rights that exist, according to Rand, are the rights to life, liberty, and property (Biddle 2011:20). Rand, like Aristotle, examines things from their natural state to gain knowledge, not from the prevailing society (Bernstein 2009:62). Therefore, what is morally good is not based on the current general belief of what is good and evil, or right and wrong (Ibid).

Only the state and criminals can violate an individual's natural rights (Rand 1963a:111). The state is needed to prevent criminals from dominating society with their gangs, and the state, in turn, must obey an objective, unalterable law that restricts its actions and limits the state to its original purpose of securing the citizens' individual rights (Rand 1963b:127).

Law is superior to authority and not a tool to realize the authority's/sovereign's commands. The exercise of authority transitions from ruling to serving (Rand 1963a:112). In such a well-functioning social system, the private individual, according to Rand, has the legal right to act as they wish (provided the action does not violate anyone else's natural rights). However, only the authority figure can act according to the legally permitted due to the constitutionally limited state. The result is that might is subordinated to right (Rand 1963b:128).

The origin of the constitution, the limitation of state power, is because each individual's life morally belongs only to themselves. Each life exists in this way as an end in itself and is therefore not a means for some abstract ultimate goal for either the collective or the "common good" (Rand 1963a:109).

Each individual has the moral right to choose their path and define their end in life, as long as they respect everyone else's natural right to the same (Rand 1963a:111). Thus, the purpose of the state is to prevent the initiation of force against one another and guarantee its citizens the pursuit of their own happiness – whatever that may be (Rand 1963a:110). By eliminating physical coercion in interpersonal interactions, the principle is established that rational discussion leads to voluntary agreement (Rand 1963b:126).

“If men are to live together in a peaceful, productive, rational society and deal with one another to mutual benefit, they must accept the basic social principle without which no moral or civilized society is possible: the principle of individual rights” (Rand 1963b:126).

The only political right that can exist is the right to one's property, where the individual themselves is included (Rand 1963a:115). This lays the foundation for the only morally acceptable political system of laissez-faire capitalism (anarcho-capitalism) (Rand 1963c:118). The only role left for political authority is what can be referred to as the night-watchman state. The state's task is threefold, each aspect aiming to protect natural rights; the police to protect against criminal elements, the military to protect against external threats, and the judiciary (courts) to regulate civil disputes based on objective legislation (Rand 1963b:131).

The political should be understood from the Aristotelian perspective of something done together through consent and voluntarism. The moral law on which all political cooperation is based is the principle of egoism. According to Rand, the moral truth is that every individual should act only to promote their own goals. The result is that society as a whole is subordinated to egoism and rational self-interest (Rand 1963b:131).

A person compelled by authority cannot live as a human, as they cannot act according to their own reason and judgment. It is impossible to achieve a life of freedom and independence by being another man's slave (Bernstein 2009:31). The only political system that can recognize individual rights to one's own life, thoughts, and pursuit of happiness is anarcho-capitalism (Bernstein 2009:10).

To embrace capitalism, the citizen must also, according to Rand, embrace the ethics of "selfishness." This means that the individual looks out for self-interest, i.e., egoism. This entails citizens moving away from self-sacrifice in redistribution policies, where others benefit at one's expense, leading to a state-imposed altruism (Bernstein 2009:31). According to Rand, altruism is when an actor gives up something of higher value at the expense of their own well-being (Rand 1961:38).

Anarcho-capitalism is the only system that can practically implement the principles of individual rights. The economic and political system leads to complete independence and the right to one's own life, where the individual, based on their reason, can pursue their own happiness without being forced to sacrifice for others (Bernstein 2009:78).

4. Empirical Data and Analysis

The chapter begins with a brief overview of the Republican Party's development leading to its current situation. It is followed by an analysis of the two actors, Molyneux and Spencer, and their support for the Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump.

4.1 Empirical Background

The post-war conservative right, which finds its political home within the Republican Party, had bottom-low confidence during the 50s and 60s, culminating under the Democratic president Lyndon Johnson in 1964. The new right was formed during that time of conservative defeat. One of the clear milestones was the conservative presidential candidate Barry Goldwater's loss to Johnson in '64 (Eagle & Day 2015:96).

The conservatives' inability to regain control of American politics led to internal strife within the Republican Party, which resulted in an increasingly clear rightward shift (Gelin 2012:14). This shift within the party became twofold: one conservatively libertarian and the other more authority-oriented. The Republican Party's presidential nominations since the 50s have had candidates representing each pole, including Barry Goldwater against Nelson Rockefeller in the 60s, and Ronald Reagan against Bob Dole in the 80s (Gelin 2012:15).

The conflicts were highlighted by the traditionally Democratic South's dissatisfaction with Johnson's "civil rights act" (Eagle & Day 2015:96, Gelin 2012:116-117). This resulted in the traditionally Republican economic conservatism and the South's ethnic conservatism merging under the Republican flag. The question was whether it was the Republicans who changed the political map by persuading the traditionally Democratic South to become Republican or if it was the South that essentially took over the Republicans (Gelin 2012:116-117).

It was only with Reagan that conservatism saw a political revival. Reagan was the first president (1981) since the post-war era who managed to rekindle the hope for a purer conservatism, with his core voters found in the American South (Gelin 2012:125).

In the 90s, the paleoconservative (national conservative) Pat Buchanan represented the party's more authoritarian rightward shift. However, he lost the party's nomination process in 1992 to Bush Sr. Buchanan has since worked as an opinion maker, criticizing the party's neoconservative direction from a nationalist perspective (Buchanan 2003). The Republicans once again found themselves in an almost existential crisis after Reagan, due to the catastrophic end of the second Bush administration along with the Democrats' strong progressive momentum felt with Obama's accession in 2008.

It became a challenge for the Republican right to recover and regain the trust of the country's electorate. In the wake of Obama's inauguration as president, a "rebellious" right-wing populist movement developed in 2009 under the name "The Tea Party" (Connolly 2010), referencing the Boston Tea Party – the starting point for American

independence from the British crown. With the Tea Party movement, the rightward shift continued further, which the party had mapped out during its renewal campaign in the 60s.

The rebellious right's anti-state rhetoric appealed to a worried American middle class after Obama's economic crisis and what Tea Party activists would call an expanded socialism that threatened the American dream. This gave further momentum to the Tea Party movement and its motto "don't tread on me," represented by Grover Norquist, among others, who acted as a Republican guiding star with the slogan "leave us alone" (Gelin 2012:18). It resonates with Reagan's rhetoric that the state is not the solution – it is the problem (Gelin 2012:121).

The rebellious right wants to free itself from centralization and supranationalism in all political areas (Gelin 2012:18). To break away from the "new" social contract and fundamentally return to the old one (the Constitution) (Gelin 2012:18). The strongest presidential candidate within the Republican Party for the libertarian right-wing direction was the libertarian Ron Paul, who lost the party's nomination process in 2012 to Mitt Romney.

The American right equates conservative values with the American self-image (Gelin 2012:14) – in other words, being American becomes synonymous with being independent and conservative. The Democrats' socialist welfare reforms are considered, by Tea Party supporters, not only counterproductive but also a personal violation. An intrusion into the private sphere, something that has led to a personal contempt from Republican supporters towards Obama (Gelin 2012:105-107). Politics has gone beyond the American self-esteem, which awakens a desire to make the USA the USA again (Gelin 2012:106).

The new rebellious right that has come to dominate the Republican Party can be categorized as both (extremely) libertarian, longing back to the American self-image, strongly anchored to the American Constitution, along with the South's (especially Arizona) skepticism towards inadequate border controls and immigration. Collectively, they can be described as representatives of a libertarian, value-conservative, and nationalist populism.

4.2 The Ban on Muslim Entry

On December 7, 2015, Trump declared his desire to implement a total ban on Muslims entering the USA. According to Trump, the campaign issue was based on the threatening climate within the Islamic world towards the USA. Trump believed such a policy would be necessary until US representatives understood what was happening. Trump justified the proposal with: "Without looking at the various polling data, it is obvious to anybody the hatred is beyond comprehension. Where this hatred comes from and why we will have to determine. Until we are able to determine and understand

this problem and the dangerous threat it poses, our country cannot be the victims of horrendous attacks by people that believe only in Jihad" (Trump 2015).

4.2.1 Radix Radio

Spencer analyzes that there are two reasons for Trump's policy statement. The first, and most obvious, is that it is a reaction to the previous terrorist attacks in France. The second reason, according to Spencer, is the refugee crisis that has affected the EU, and he claims that this should be the underlying, actual reason for the policy proposal. The purpose of the policy, according to Spencer, is then to preempt what has developed into a crisis in the EU, and to prevent it from happening in the USA (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

Richard Spencer's initial reaction to Trump's statement was that it was a campaign trick to stir reactions towards his own candidacy. According to Spencer, Trump must have been aware of the enormous publicity he would receive if he opened that door (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

The reaction to the proposal, summarized by Spencer, was: "Chocking insult to our, American, core values" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09, 01:18).

Spencer further attributed the reactions to two categories: those who argued that such a policy would be deeply immoral and those who claimed that such a reform would be outright illegal and in direct conflict with the American Constitution (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

However, Spencer states that such a policy would not only be entirely legitimate but also desirable. According to Spencer, such a policy would clarify that there is indeed an "us" and a "them" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09, 02:10). The own political entity as an authority constitutes the law and decides who should be included by it.

The people who were upset and even shocked by Trump's proposal seem to assume that the USA is a platform for "everyone." Spencer argues that this is not the case, and instead, he formulates it as that the USA is our country, and our, constitutional, rights do not extend to the "others" – they are reserved for us. According to Spencer, it is desirable that the USA discriminates against other groups (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

Spencer argues that if no distinction is made, it results in the USA no longer being a nation. If "everyone" has a "right" to the USA, it will inevitably lead to the end of an "us" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09). Trump is rational, according to Spencer, when his proposal makes politics real again. Politics becomes real and existential as it departs from trivial nonsense such as school policy (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09, 05:00). The policy thus restores the view of the USA as a nation when politics is once again conducted for its own survival.

According to Spencer, religion is considered something individual and private in the USA, something that can be shaped and chosen – a lifestyle choice. He argues that this is a misconception. Religion is not an individual expression but a worldview that leads to the collective. This, in turn, results in how we understand our surroundings (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

Religion is collectivist; it unites a group over both time and geographical space. Religion, according to Spencer, constitutes the collective historical experience that spans generations and national borders. Spencer mentions Christianity as an example of what has held the West together despite the many other boundaries (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

Islam and Muslims are in the same way, according to Spencer, a collective. They are not just a religious entity but also a geopolitical player. Even if Muslims are not a race, they are strongly linked to an ethnicity (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09, 09:40). This in turn means that when Trump talks about Islam and Muslims, he is not talking about individuals' lifestyle choices; he is creating the Schmittian friend-enemy distinction. According to Spencer, he points out an enemy group based on ethnicity, geographical location, and historical experience. Identifying a terrorist as a Muslim says more about the individual, from both his self-image and history, than referring to him as a "citizen" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09). It raises value questions about how citizenship should be viewed. Spencer rhetorically questions whether an African Muslim can really be considered, for example, a French citizen? (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09, 11:50). It makes it possible to question a citizen's right to their citizenship. There is an "us," and it is not enough to adhere to American values to partake in America. If a domestic attack occurs, it is a Muslim who has attacked the USA, not a citizen (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-09).

4.2.2 Freedomain Radio

Molyneux states that there is not only hatred against the USA but also against the Western values that the USA represents. He also points out that Trump's proposal only applies until we fully understand what is happening and that we do not know who the jihadists are. The proposal is meant to prevent an attack – it is not a permanent policy proposal (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09).

The criticism Molyneux has noted, which he believes is also fueled by the establishment media, is that the policy proposal is unconstitutional and therefore illegal.

Paraphrase: "It is strange how the MSM (Mainstream Media), which always defends our constitutional rights, especially when it comes to the Second Amendment, is now questioning whether the proposal is constitutional or not" (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09, 02:00).

The irony in the paraphrase above refers to the establishment media, which, according to Molyneux, pushes for restrictions on the constitutional right to bear arms according to the Second Amendment. Molyneux thus argues that the critics are not interested in the law or the Constitution but are instead politically driven and, in this case, saw an opportunity to use the Constitution to influence politics according to their own preferences. Molyneux believes this is an expression of left-liberal hypocrisy.

According to Molyneux, the left-liberal logic goes as follows: Obama tries to curb the Constitution's Second Amendment (the right to bear arms) to prevent mass shootings. Trump, on the other hand, says we must pause the entry of Muslims into the country because it is currently impossible to determine who are jihadists. Molyneux then rhetorically asks: Who is fighting against the Constitution? (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09, 05:00).

Moreover, Molyneux comments further that the Constitution applies to American citizens and not to foreigners; a non-citizen cannot invoke the constitutional rights reserved for the country's citizens. However, Molyneux points out that Sharia laws are not compatible with the Constitution (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09, 07:20), implying that the law is natural and should not be altered by either Obama or Muslims. The latter could be denied entry to the USA if they aim to influence the political system, regardless of whether the political influence is through violence, i.e., terrorism, or through the ballot box, i.e., democracy.

Molyneux argues that it is impossible to know who is a jihadist or not among people coming from a geographical area dominated by Islamists with Sharia laws and oppression against Christians. He compares it to eating M&Ms (candy) where you know that 25 percent of the candy is poisoned. A good idea, according to Molyneux, at that point would be to stop eating the candy (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09, 06:00).

Molyneux points out that the USA is at war in the Middle East and that it is irrational to bring in refugees from those areas, which mainly consist of young men. Especially since ISIS has already declared that they intend to infiltrate the refugee wave with jihadists (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09, 06:40). Molyneux further compares it to the USA not letting in young German men during World War II, as it would have been impossible to know if they were Nazis or not.

Quote: "If you invade the world, you can't invite the world - you got to pick one, if you want to invite the world, stop invading it" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 21:50).

Thus, it is a self-destructive behavior that is irrational and altruistic, where one helps others by harming oneself. There is no gain for oneself, only for the others, and it goes against Molyneux's theoretical standpoint within anarcho-capitalism as a system based on mutual trade-offs.

Islam is not just a religion according to Molyneux; it is also a political system, a dictatorial theocracy, where there is no separation between state and church (Molyneux, FDR 3149, 2015-12-12). Thus, the policy proposal is not based on religious grounds but political ones. It is meant to prevent subversive activities. To the counterargument that it is not an expression of "real" Islam or that it is all of Islam that wants to destroy the West, Molyneux responds that he heard the same thing about communism:

Paraphrase: "I heard the same thing about communism 'It is not real communism'. But everywhere communism has been practiced, it has also proven to be literally deadly. It is exactly the same with Islam – it is real as we see it, and if it were practiced here, it would also be deadly for us" (Molyneux, FDR 3146, 2015-12-09, 26:00).

4.2.3 Summary

Both Molyneux and Spencer fully support Trump's policy proposal for a ban on Muslim entry, and they do so clearly based on their respective theoretical standpoints.

Molyneux believes that the state and authority should be subordinate to the Constitution, which is the basis of all law. Molyneux adheres to the theoretical standpoint that the Constitution is meant for "us" and that it cannot be a legal violation when it concerns a "them". This falls within Rand's view of freedom as an absolutist form of so-called negative freedom – that is, total freedom of action, but never at an imposed cost to another party. A person can thus only be free to leave a group but can never demand to belong to another group. Molyneux adheres to the universality of objectivism by asserting that the same principle should apply to everyone. Therefore, Molyneux reacts against the left-liberal establishment, which he believes does not adhere to universality as they both defend and attack the Constitution depending on the situation according to their narrative.

Molyneux's view of the law and the Constitution aligns with the idea that it is natural and thus also above alteration. This is evident in both his defense of the Second Amendment and his support for Trump's entry ban proposal, which Molyneux perceives could lead to Muslim influence over the law. The law is thus, according to Molyneux, above all. For Spencer, on the other hand, the law is subordinate to the subjective will of the friend-group, where the policy proposal is in order because it primarily protects and recognizes the own group.

Spencer's designation of the group, Muslims, becomes crucial for a friend and enemy distinction, so that terrorists are not identified as citizens, regardless of what is stated in the passport. This deviates from the individual view towards the perpetrator, which would imply a legal matter. Grouping makes it a political issue, according to Schmitt's political conceptualization.

This also changes the mindset regarding immigration from the Middle East; they, Spencer and Molyneux, do not think of them as refugees consisting of individuals who need help; instead, they think of them in terms of Islam. This creates the political entity of the others. In this case, the political entity of Islam that must be fought. This lays the foundation for the Schmittian absolute enmity. Islam becomes incompatible with "us" on both levels – 1, our way of life, and 2, our actual existence as "we," in this case, white Americans for Spencer and free people for Molyneux.

It is also from a "we" that politics and authority emanate, the own political grouping that decides who the enemy is, and whether the legal should relate to the designated enemy. In Spencer's case, this opens up the legal exception of, for example, citizens not being referred to as citizens and part of the own grouping but instead referred to as an enemy grouping.

They thus agree that there is a group belonging of an us to which the "foreign" culture with Islam lacks access. For Molyneux, it is primarily rooted in a philosophical basis, and for Spencer, the groups are incompatible on a broader level, with both culture and ethnicity.

4.3 The Geopolitical

Foreign policy has been a clear dividing line not only between Clinton and Trump but also between Trump and the Republican Party. Trump has, among other things, stated that he is willing to let Assad remain as president in Syria and that he is prepared to cooperate with both Assad and Russia to fight ISIS.

4.3.1 Radix Radio

According to Spencer, the political game on the international stage can fundamentally change with Trump as president.

Quote: "Trump has said things like me and Vladimir Putin actually will get along. Washington and Moscow, America and Russia will no longer be at each other's throat" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 00:50).

This is something Spencer interprets as very positive, and he continues that there seems to be some form of understanding between Trump and Putin (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 02:50). An understanding that can lead to a fundamental paradigm shift in international relations (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19).

Spencer perceives that Putin wants Trump to win, and it is not about them syncing as two strong leaders but instead about how they view politics (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19).

Spencer refers to the potentially improved relationship that will occur with a Trump administration, depending on both leaders' understanding of politics as exclusive. In

this regard, Spencer refers to Carl Schmitt as one of our time's greatest thinkers, along with the earlier Hobbes (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19). Schmitt conceptualized politics as identifying who is an enemy or a friend; it is the very definition of politics (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 05:00).

A political enmity does not necessarily mean a lack of mutual respect. Wars were previously an integrated part of foreign policy, and the wars were not fought with the aim of eliminating the enemy. The wars were often limited, and there was mutual respect between the enemies. The limited war meant that both warring states remained after the war, without any "legal" reprisals, where the leadership of the defeated side would be brought to justice (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19).

Quote: "You could have wars in the 18th and 19th century Europe, you could defeat an enemy but still recognize that he was a legitimate actor and that he would still exist after the war was over… without the need of converting the enemy to your ideology" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 06:28).

It was not an "All or nothing war" – win or disappear, where an unconditional surrender of the defeated enemy was required, as in the wars of the 20th century (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19).

Spencer sees the tendency for wars to be absolute within what he calls the current free world and the American neo-conservative sphere, where there is an attitude that Spencer describes as follows:

Quote: "It ´s better to be dead than red… and that we need to roll back the Soviet Union" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 07:55).

There is no room for understanding or negotiations because there is no respect for the other side. This means that the diplomatic solution of live and let live is given little room (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19). Spencer attributes this view to the current diplomatic situation between the USA and Russia, where Putin is seen as an illegitimate power-hungry leader comparable to a South American drug cartel leader who has managed to take political power to promote his own interests (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 09:40).

According to Spencer, the current American foreign policy, which will continue if Clinton wins the election, is based on a liberalism that has gone mad – where the world is to be converted to American values and ideals, where even the rights of homosexuals are to be in focus within the foreign policy (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 12:00). According to Spencer, Putin may see Trump as someone who can change the ideologically driven foreign policy that makes constructive cooperation between the USA and Russia impossible. Trump can be the one who starts to see Russia and Putin as a legitimate antagonist again. This can create mutual respect; even if they do not become friends, they can start to accept each other's existence, acknowledge each other's interests,

and thus create a "common ground." In that context, Putin will not be an actor to be annihilated but someone with whom cooperation can be established (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19).

Quote: "The two big parts of the white world, the Slavic Russian world and the white American world, might finally cease to be at each other's throats and might finally reach an understanding... The understanding between Trump and Putin might point to something groundbreaking, paradigm-shifting, and something monumental for the future" (Spencer, Radix, 2015-12-19, 20:19).

4.3.2 Freedomain Radio

Molyneux emphasizes the seriousness of geopolitical tensions on the international stage. He suggests that if the current direction of American foreign policy, dominated by the "war on terrorism," continues, tensions risk escalating into a third world war (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18).

Molyneux supports this claim by referencing the Russian media narrative:

Quote: "The potential war with the US is the top headline in the Russian media" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 06:00).

The Russian media narrative, however, is directed against Clinton, viewing Trump as the peace candidate:

Quote: "In contrast with Clinton, Trump has no appetite for war with Russia" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 06:00).

Molyneux shares the Russian media's perception, citing that both Clinton and Biden have threatened potential military consequences in response to a cyberattack (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 22:40).

Molyneux argues that the current American foreign policy and its approach to Russia is inherently dangerous and risks escalating into a third, nuclear, world war. He compares the US presence in Europe and the installation of a new missile system to the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, where the roles were reversed, almost leading to a war with the risk of mutual destruction (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18).

Similar to the past, a counter-reaction will occur to counter what is perceived as a direct threat to one's own interests. Molyneux refers to Russian political scientist Stanislav Belkovsky, who stated that Russia is preparing for a major war if Hillary is elected, according to ETF (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18).

Quote: "He (Putin) has instructed his military leaders to prepare for imminent war if Hillary is elected according to ETF" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 11:45).

Molyneux believes this partly stems from the disastrous war on terrorism, its military interventions, and attempts at nation-building. With a Clinton administration, this policy will continue as usual, if not intensify (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18).

Quote: "In Clinton, Russia sees the polar opposite – a progressive ideologue who will stubbornly adhere to moral posture regardless of their consequences" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 32:00).

Thus, according to Molyneux, it is evident that a Clinton administration not only risks conflict with Russia but will indeed lead to it. He believes Russia views the choice between the two presidential candidates in this way:

Quote: "Moscow prefers Trump not because it sees him as easily manipulated, but because his 'America First' agenda coincides with its own view of international relations. Russia seeks a return to classic international law – governments negotiate based on mutually understood self-interests, unstrained by ideology" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 30:00).

Unlike Clinton, Molyneux argues, Trump is not ideologically driven, allowing him to negotiate with Putin and Russia, enabling both parties to reach a sustainable and mutually beneficial solution – a win-win scenario (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18). This approach is crucial, according to Molyneux, as we face the risk of the MAD doctrine (Mutual Assured Destruction – nuclear war) being tested (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18).

Trump, unlike Clinton, has also expressed willingness to work with Russia, not against them, to defeat ISIS (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18).

Molyneux views the choice between Clinton and Trump as ideological – between globalism (supranationality), which leads to conflict against those who oppose it, and nationalism, which allows for constructive intergovernmental dialogue.

Quote: "All that cares about individualist, Ayn Rand fans, all the libertarians and all the anarchy-capitalist. All those minarchist want a government close to you and as small as possible. Nationalism is preferable to globalism... The government closest to you are more preferable than that far away" (Molyneux, FDR 3434, 2016-10-03, 25:30).

Molyneux's approach to the international geopolitical arena aligns with anarcho-capitalist principles. He believes Trump would negotiate with the premise that all parties involved should benefit, whereas Clinton would seek confrontation to force Russia into alignment with the globalization process. Consequently, according to Molyneux, it is impossible to achieve a constructive outcome with Clinton.

Additionally, Clinton is financially connected to George Soros, whose organization, the Open Society Foundation, is considered a threat to Russia's internal stability due to its

alleged involvement in Eastern Europe's "Color Revolutions" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 33:00).

According to Molyneux, the Russian security service warns that Soros, if given the opportunity, would also try to subject Russia to a color revolution. This leads to Molyneux's ultimate conclusion:

Quote: "If you are interested in Peace, Donald Trump is your peace candidate" (Molyneux, FDR 3459, 2016-10-18, 35:00).

4.3.3 Summary

Both Spencer and Molyneux believe a geopolitical paradigm shift is preferable to the status quo, and both trust that Trump can be the person to implement what they see as a necessary change in the international political arena. The significant change would be the acceptance of the legitimacy of other parties based on their interests, without ideological blinders. Neither believes ideology should be spread through foreign policy; the focus is instead on what their own group can gain, not on how their group can impose change on the "other."

This occurs through a return to diplomacy, where two parties negotiate based on a mutual understanding that they both act out of rational self-interest. For Spencer, it is a pursuit of returning to the legitimate enemy, an enemy who does not need to be good or bad, but who is the "other." Another party that the own party understands has its narrative and interests that do not need to align with one's own ideological perspective. Just as the own nation protects its interests, there must also be an understanding that the other does the same.

In this context, Spencer and Molyneux's views on the geopolitical level partially overlap. For Molyneux, it is two rational actors acting out of self-interest. Where both actors, regardless of domestic politics or ideological conditions, ask themselves – can I gain from negotiating with the other party? If the answer is affirmative for both, a constructive negotiating position exists.

With Spencer's view of Trump and international interaction, it is clear that his ideological perspective on how foreign policy should be conducted is partly rooted in realism but primarily looking back to the power politics of the 19th century. The time and politics that shaped Schmitt and which he defended. Thus, it is also an implicit critique of the liberal international collaborations that emerged after World War I and were re-established after World War II precisely to suppress international power politics. A clear change with liberalization was that wars became illegitimate, and thus the enemy also became illegitimate. This meant that the potential enemy, the other, also had to be held accountable.

Therefore, both are also opponents of Globalism – for Spencer, it is the cessation of the political definition of friend and foe distinction as globalism strives for its abolition through greater unification. For Molyneux, opposition to globalism is based on its tendencies towards supranationality when he instead principally calls for decentralization. The power center should be as close to the individual as possible, and then nationalism, according to Molyneux, is preferable to globalism.

Both parties, Spencer and Molyneux, have the primary starting point from themselves, and it plays little or no role what happens with the "other" party, the enemy group. The other is an accepted actor with whom cooperation and negotiation are based on one's rational goal – what is good for oneself, the own group. This aligns with both Spencer's and Molyneux's theoretical premises, where the former's friend and foe distinction become, with the latter, two independent groups that interact with each other based on the mutual possibility of tradeoffs.

4.4 Immigration

Trump was the candidate who made immigration a prominent election issue, with his provocative presentation of the need for a wall, which would also be financed by Mexico, gaining significant media attention. Immigration was a hot election issue for Trump, setting him apart from all other presidential candidates.

4.4.1 Radix Radio

For Spencer, the immigration issue and the need for fundamental reforms are of existential value. According to Spencer, Trump is the only candidate who has truly brought the issue to the political agenda (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10, 22:00). Clinton, on the other hand, stands in stark contrast to Trump through her statements about wanting to increase immigration (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10, 19:00). Spencer explains this by noting that her strongest support comes from minorities, particularly Blacks and Latinos. With this insight, Spencer identifies the Republicans (excluding Trump) as the biggest enemy. This is because the Republicans' core voters are within the white population, and the party does not highlight the demographic change, making the Republican establishment a bigger enemy than Clinton and the Democrats.

If a fundamental political change is to be sustainable, according to Spencer, one must attack those closest to them, and in this context, Trump becomes the light in the tunnel within the Republican darkness (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10, 22:30). With Trump, a new political perspective can become dominant within the Republicans at the expense of the old conservative movement, which, according to Spencer, does not have what it takes to prevent the demographic change.

Quote: “The tea party movement are talking about the constitution suddenly being in jeopardy when they are really reacting to a demographic transformation” (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10, 51:58).

The big problem for Spencer is that politics is not based on ethnicity and blood (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10, 35:30), but he sees a possible discursive change with Trump reintroducing nationalism to America (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10, 53:00). Realpolitically, according to Spencer, this means that Trump also opens up for the alternative right (alt-right) and its ideas, giving it a platform that was previously unthinkable (Spencer, Radix, 2016-07-10).

The discursive shift moves away from the previous hegemonic approach to America as an immigrant nation where everyone, regardless of origin, has access (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01).

Quote: "The big thing with Donald Trump is the possibility for a real sustainable immigration reform" (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01, 05:40).

The political change Spencer hopes for with Trump is a return to the immigration policy that existed before the, according to Spencer, catastrophic immigration reform introduced in 1965 by Lyndon Johnson. A reform that has also dominated the political climate ever since (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01, 06:00).

Returning to the previous immigration policy is crucial for America's future because it is that policy, according to Spencer, that accounts for the demographic change. He expresses it as:

Quote: “The wall and cracking down on illegals, it’s all great, but, we at the alt-right need to be aware of the nonsense that race is irrelevant, it’s all about becoming a legal citizen” (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01, 09:55).

For Spencer, the real danger in immigration policy is legal immigration. He expresses that illegal immigrants come and go, work under the table, and then leave the country, and the "bad" elements within illegal immigration either kill each other or end up in prison. Therefore, there is no category within illegal immigration, according to Spencer, that threatens America's demographics to remain a white country.

Quote: "The massive transformation that has been taken place is due to legal immigration, we need to be real about that... say that it is a massive crackdown, we are registering Muslims, we are doing extreme vetting, we are building a wall – this will fundamentally not change where we need to go" (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01, 11:40).

According to Spencer, Trump cannot say these things outright, and there Spencer sees his own role in helping to shape the discourse and narrative to how people generally view the immigration issue, making it a political problem fundamentally about demographics and not about legal versus illegal immigration.

According to Spencer, however, a political shift is an urgent necessity for their own survival (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01, 13:00). He concludes that if Trump does not live up to this necessity, then the entire Trump movement is nothing more than a major failure.

Quote: “I just say this: The wall is great, but if we just build the wall and it’s about illegal immigration and Trump doesn’t fundamentally address the legal immigration issue… If we don’t engage in serious immigration limitation then the entire Trump thing is a major failure” (Spencer, Radix, 2016-12-01, 13:30).

4.4.2 Freedomain Radio

According to Molyneux, it’s a good starting point to ask oneself what one gains from specific immigration (Molyneux, FDR 3515, 2016-12-01, 20:00). Molyneux wants as small a state as possible, and for that to be realized, his fellow citizens, who can influence the direction of governmental authority, must also desire as small a government administration as possible. The West "invented" political freedom, and it’s a Western tradition. However, if superstitious religious people come who want to unite state and religion, freedom will be threatened. According to Molyneux, Muslims want to live under Sharia law (Molyneux, FRD 3149, 2015-12-12).

If these people want the freedom that exists in the USA, they have the manual on how to achieve it — according to Molyneux, they can just go home and do what the West has done; the solution is right in front of them (Molyneux, FRD 3149, 2015-12-12, 19:30). This statement should be understood in the context of the current immigration policy, which, according to Molyneux, was implemented over the heads of the majority population.

Quote: “White Christian Americans were never asked if they want to be a minority in their own country” (Molyneux, FRD 3149, 2015-12-12, 17:50).

According to Molyneux, it’s a completely reasonable question to ask, and no one raises an eyebrow when it’s asked in other countries, but as soon as it concerns a white country, it suddenly becomes about racism (Molyneux, FRD 3149, 2015-12-12). According to Molyneux, so-called white guilt, the fear of being called racist, along with America’s pathological altruism, will lead to the downfall of the West (Molyneux, FRD 3146, 2015-12-09).

If the USA abandons its ingroup preferences, it will lead to the destruction of society, according to Molyneux. It is entirely acceptable for all groups to have ingroup preferences, but not for whites. The rhetorical question asked is what’s wrong with whites wanting to help whites? (Molyneux, FRD 3146, 2015-12-09, 25:00).

Treating different "races" differently is racist, and accepting Israel’s immigration policy while opposing the same reforms in the West makes that person, according to

Molyneux, undoubtedly also a racist (against whites) (Molyneux, FRD 3146, 2015-12-09, 23:30). Israel's immigration policy is based on preserving the country's Jewish identity (Ibid).

According to Molyneux, we (the West) have come to where we are through a long and drawn-out struggle to create a civilization of peace and freedom. We have the recipe, and it is not classified, and it is up to everyone, according to Molyneux, to adopt it. A choice others can make, which does not include that they must come to the USA (Molyneux, FRD 3146, 2015-12-09).

Molyneux points out that the Democrats shifted immigration policy in 1965 from mainly European immigration to focusing more on the third world. According to Molyneux, this happened to import votes for the Democratic Party. For the Democrats, immigration policy becomes a reciprocal relationship where creating a welfare-dependent electorate gives votes to the Democrats in exchange for benefits (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29, 03:00).

The significant difference between the earlier European immigration was that they came for freedom, while the latter, from the third world, come for free stuff (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29, 05:00).

Quote: "If you come for the freedom, you add value, and if you come for the free stuff, you subtract value" (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29, 05:20).

Molyneux points out that the rapid development risks changing the country's demographics, which is what this election is really about. The demographic change under the mentioned condition of benefit dependence will alter both the political landscape (to the left) and the cultural landscape, thereby also threatening Western cultural values such as personal freedom and the free market economy (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29).

Quote: "People who are dependent on the state will never vote for the diminishment of the state" (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29, 06:30).

This, in turn, contributes to a struggle not over ideas but over control of tax funds — between those who pay taxes and those who have become benefit-dependent.

Quote: "Democracy is no longer about ideas, but that of theft and defense" (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29, 06:50).

If immigration continues as it has since the 60s, the USA will become balkanized without a clear majority population. According to Molyneux, this wouldn't necessarily be a problem if immigrants shared the philosophical foundation that created American exceptionalism with the limited state. If these groups share the idea of a free market economy, separation of church and state, and the bill of rights, there would be no

ideological reason to deny them entry. There might be other reasons, but they would potentially be based on prejudice (Molyneux, FDR 3473, 2016-10-29, 09:50).

4.4.3 Summary

Both agree that this is one of the election's crucial issues and that the issue fundamentally concerns demographics. For Spencer, it’s about the USA remaining a white country, and for Molyneux, it’s about remaining a free and capitalist country. Spencer and Molyneux converge when the distinction between cultures and identities is transferred by Molyneux to the political. The fact that some cultural expressions lean left makes them incompatible with the American identity, which, according to Molyneux, originates from the white Western Renaissance. Thus, a certain collectivization coincides with Spencer's perspective of the ingroup based on blood and ethnicity.

The ingroup from which politics should be conducted is very clear for Spencer; it is the white population, and it is from this perspective that immigration policy should be driven. For Molyneux, it’s more from a philosophical standpoint, a philosophy rooted in the Western and thus synonymous with whites, meaning "us" in a political sense. The subsequent question is what is required to belong to "us." For Spencer, the answer would be blood, and for Molyneux, a full acknowledgment of Western values and a shared understanding of freedom to want to pursue the limited state.

The only way for Molyneux to ensure that those who come do so for American and Western values is a complete dissolution of the welfare state, making permanent benefit tourism impossible, which according to Molyneux would result in a negative feedback loop between socialism and benefit-dependent electorate.

Both Spencer and Molyneux see Lyndon B. Johnson's 1965 immigration reform as the starting point for what they perceive as the problematic challenge they face today. For Spencer, it’s primarily America's demographic composition that threatens the American identity as "white," something Molyneux partially agrees with since the political decision was not preceded by a referendum on whether the white population agreed to become a minority in their own country. Molyneux's biggest objection to the immigration reform, however, was that it mainly resulted in a political shift to the left.

Molyneux creates the group dynamics between friend-enemy distinctions based on the philosophical — the idealistic, based on anarcho-capitalism. He equates current immigration with the communist ideology and its transgressions against the individual. Therefore, it poses a danger to the rational person to risk a larger number of irrational people whose life choices will have extremely, according to Molyneux, negative consequences for the former.

The only way, according to Molyneux, to determine if someone comes for freedom or benefits is a total dismantling of the welfare state — no subsidies, no public healthcare, no benefits — which would result in a self-cleaning that those who come do so for freedom. Anarcho-capitalism is based on trade-offs, and in connection with Molyneux's view of the refugee wave, this path is unidirectional. So, the big question for Molyneux becomes: where is the individual citizen's gain in accepting a group that is not compatible with their own value system?

According to Molyneux, the domestic white population wants a small state, and the immigrant benefit-dependent population wants a larger state. The new conditions make it almost impossible, according to Molyneux, for a traditional Republican presidential candidate to win an election. For both Spencer and Molyneux, the same fact means a slow erasure of their own political entity — an ideological entity for Molyneux and a racial one for Spencer.

5. Conclusion

Both Spencer and Molyneux gave their explicit support to Trump's controversial policy proposals, and both argued clearly from their respective theoretical perspectives why the policy proposals were not only legitimate but also desirable.

To answer the question of how the political theoretical convergence can be understood, the results of this study need to be placed in relation to the empirical background and the recent developments within the Republican Party. Seen in this context, perhaps Democrat Daniel Patrick Moynihan wasn't entirely wrong when he described the internal struggle of the Republican Party as between a Jeffersonian libertarian, individualistic rebellious perspective versus a more authoritarian and centrally controlled Hamiltonian perspective. These two streams have always been more or less in polemic against each other within the party, until now with Trump.

In the party's recent history, both the authoritarian Pat Buchanan and the libertarian Ron Paul failed to conquer the party, which could indicate Trump's successes in somehow managing to unite them. Or it might be entirely the opposite, that Donald Trump is what happens when both the perspectives of Jefferson and Hamilton failed to make their respective impacts through Paul and Buchanan.

This also aligns with Molyneux's expression: "We anarcho-capitalists won't get what we want, but here the alternatives are clear" (Molyneux, FDR 3434, 2016-10-03).

Thereby, ideological and pragmatic limitations arise within anarcho-capitalism and political theoretical voluntarism. The limitation occurs within the ingroup, defining who gets access to the free market. What's categorized as the ingroup, where the political enemy lacks access, is determined by both Spencer and Molyneux more by identity and interests than by the legal aspect of citizenship. In this regard, democracy in the form of

the majority's will becomes secondary — natural rights should not be subject to being voted away, and the wellbeing of the ingroup should not be based on majority opinion.

This gives rise to the political theoretical convergence that could be termed anarcho-fascism.

Where Schmitt expresses it as the law must sometimes be upheld at the expense of the law itself, through the sovereign's legal exception, in this context it translates to voluntarism being preserved at the expense of voluntarism. Voluntary interaction with other actors is limited to ensure the continued possibility of voluntary interactions for the identified ingroup.

The common starting point becomes the identification of the own ingroup as tribal, a view of the political based on tribal affiliation. In this specific case, it's the view of America as a white country for whites. Where other cultural expressions are not compatible with the freedom established in the West and thus become a distinct external group that should be denied access. If the external peoples and cultures adopt a libertarian state perspective with a free market economy, from an anarcho-fascist viewpoint, it's not even secondary; it's irrelevant. The essential thing is that the externals do not burden the own ingroup. The overall generalizability of this study's results to the political theoretical convergence can be summarized as everything being about an "us," where the individual's own gain in a trade-off coincides with the collectivization that occurs with the political entity that Schmitt categorizes as the "friend" group.

The theoretical concept of freedom that Molyneux supports implies total freedom of action as long as that action does not infringe on someone else's natural rights. In practice, this means the possibility to exclude actors from one's own voluntarily entered groups. An actor thus never has the freedom to demand access, only the freedom to enter and leave groups. Walls are built to keep people "out," not "in." The two ideological streams can thus converge into a "friend" group if the theoretical possibility exists for the individual to deviate. Hence, Molyneux's explicit support for the Second Amendment (the right to form militias and bear arms), which serves as a check and balance against the individual being swallowed up by their own collective, in the form of, for example, a tyrannical exercise of authority. It becomes a fundamental determinant that ensures popular consent to leadership and the balance to the common identity that must prevail between governance and the people for there to be any possibility of voluntary submission to authority.

The power distribution sought can be understood from both the libertarian and authoritarian state. The free minimalist state means that the authority must be weak enough for the population to leave it but strong enough that no external can conquer it. From this perspective, the authority must be both the smallest and largest possible at

the same time. Advocates of libertarian voluntarism and authoritarianism thus converge when the state's self-preservation is set against external threats.

It becomes freedom through the leader, the sovereign, and the authority. The two political ideological streams become two sides of the state coin. On one side is the duty to submit to the state and the sovereign to uphold law and security. On the other side are the citizens' inalienable rights. Using the term anarcho-fascism for their convergence as the minting of the coin, Schmittian becomes the political framework, and Randian its ideological aspiration.

Since politics, according to Schmitt, rests on the actual decision and is an entity conducted by one against another, the libertarian seeks de-politicized voluntarism within their own identified "friend" group. The price paid for freedom through the leader is the total restriction of voluntarism in interactions with externals outside the own group. The objective and the universal become subject and reserved for the own group's subjectivity.

The coexistence between the two political theories thus becomes possible as long as consent exists for the divine sovereign and legislator through their unifying identity with the own group where freedom is to be upheld. However, coexistence can only occur unidirectionally toward the authoritarian. Since the Schmittian political perspective is synonymous with conflict, politics means that one group, the political entity, wins, and another group loses. An adherent to the theoretical perspective, like Spencer, can never adopt the view that politics is something conducted anarchically and harmoniously together. Such a political idea is reserved only for the own political entity, which constitutes the "friend" group in the friend-enemy distinction. A hockey team will never win if they do not distinguish between their own players and the opposing team's players. If an individual player cannot make the fundamental distinction needed to win the game, they will not get any playtime either.

The reverse becomes possible, that someone viewing politics from the Aristotelian meaning, something Rand shares, that politics is something conducted together and voluntarily. That player would be welcome to the winning team and enter the game as long as their understanding of "together" is reserved for the own team, i.e., the own political entity. The fundamental possibility of bringing together the two political streams, between Molyneux and Spencer, is the harmonious identification of the own group and the acknowledgment of politics as an activity between friends and enemies.

The step to a friend-enemy distinction of politics doesn't necessarily have to be far for voluntarists and anarcho-capitalists since their understanding of "together" is already actor-based, but focused on the voluntarily entered interactions based on mutual gain. They only move from a harmonious actor relationship to an antagonistic one. Among voluntarists and anarcho-capitalists, the fundamental touching point making anarcho-

fascism possible also emerges — the right of the strong. Within fascism, it is conspicuously evident that the strong have the right to devour the weak, the own group has the right to dominate through its ability to do so. For the voluntarist anarcho-capitalist, it becomes instead that the weak perishes if they cannot possibly offer anything of value to the capable. For both, it thus becomes central that the strong flourish without being hindered by the weak. On a collectivized level, it equates to the need for the own political entity to thrive unimpeded by any potential enemy groups.

Thus, according to this study's results, it is not fascists who become anarchists — it is anarchists who become fascists.

5.1 Further Research

With the conclusion of the unidirectional movement from one ideological stream to the other, it could be interesting to investigate the phenomenon further within the libertarian movement and examine more closely how libertarians relate to the new alternative right. This could be done by examining membership changes within the Libertarian Party or by looking at how various alternative media with a pronounced libertarian character relate to the alternative right. It could also be interesting to examine how the alternative right's environment relates to the libertarian and whether further interaction between them begins to crystallize.

6. References

Aradau, Claudia (2008) “Forget Equality? Security and Liberty in the 'War on Terror'”, Alternatives: Global, Local, Political 33 (3): 293-314
Beckman, Ludvig (2005) Fundamental Book on Idea Analysis, Stockholm: Santaréus
Benoist, Alain (2013) Carl Schmitt Today, Arktos Media Ltd
Bernstein, Andrew (2009) Ayn Rand for Beginners, Hanover: Steerforth Press
Biddle, Craig (2011) “Ayn Rand's Theory of Rights: The Moral Foundation of a Free Society”, The Objective Standard, 6 (3): 13-36
Branden, Nathaniel (1984) “The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand” Journal of Humanistic Psychology 24 (4): 39-64
Burns, Jennifer (2009) Goddess of the Market: Ayn Rand and the American Right, Oxford University Press
Eagle, John Red & Day, Vox (2015) Cuckservative: How “Conservatives” Betrayed America, Kouvola: Castalia House
Gelin, Martin (2012) The American Right: The Republican Revolution and the Future of the USA, Stockholm: Natur & Kultur
Heidegren (2012) “Carl Schmitt's Political Anthropology”, pp. 127-144 in Arvidsson et al. (2012) Friend or Foe? An Anthology on Carl Schmitt's Political Thought, Gothenburg: Daidalos
Hyldegaard, Kirsten (2008) Theory of Science: A Fundamental Book for Pedagogical Subjects, Stockholm: Liber
Krueckeberg, John (2011) “Goddess of the Market: Ayn Rand and the American Right” Literature & History, 20 (1): 92-116
Lynn Doty, Roxanne (2007) “States of Exception on the Mexico-U.S. Border: Security, ‘Decisions’, and Civilian Border Patrols,” International Political Sociology, 1 (2): 113-137
Neocleous, Mark (1996) “Perpetual War, or ‘War and War Again’” Philosophy & Social Criticism, 22 (2): 47-66
Rand, Ayn (1961) “The Objectivist Ethics”, pp. 13-39 in Rand, Ayn (1964) The Virtue of Selfishness, London: Penguin
Rand, Ayn (1963a) “Man’s Rights”, pp. 108-117 in Rand, Ayn (1964) The Virtue of Selfishness, London: Penguin
Rand, Ayn (1963b) “The Nature of Government”, pp. 125-134 in Rand, Ayn (1964) The Virtue of Selfishness, London: Penguin
Rand, Ayn (1963c) “Collectivized ‘Rights’”, pp. 93-99 in Rand, Ayn (1964) The Virtue of Selfishness, London: Penguin
Schmitt, Carl (2010) The Concept of the Political, translated by Svenja Hums, Gothenburg: Daidalos
Schmitt, Carl (2005) Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty, translated by George Schwab, Chicago: Chicago University Press
Schwab, George (2005) “Introduction”, pp. xxxvii-lii in Schmitt, Carl (2005) Political

Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty, translated by George Schwab, Chicago: Chicago University Press
Strong, Tracy (2005) “Foreword”, pp. vii-xxxv in Schmitt, Carl (2005) Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty, translated by George Schwab, Chicago: Chicago University Press
Wittrock, Jon (2012) “Place and Space”, pp. 49-78 in Arvidsson et al. (2012) Friend or Foe? An Anthology on Carl Schmitt's Political Thought, Gothenburg: Daidalos

6.1 Internet

Buchanan, Patrick (2003-03-24) “Whose War?”, The American Conservative
Connolly, Katie (2010-09-16) “What exactly is the Tea Party?” BBC
MacWilliams, Matthew (2016-01-17) “The one weird trait that predicts whether you're a Trump supporter”, Politico
Trump, Donald (2015-12-07) “Donald J. Trump statement on preventing Muslim immigration”, Donald J. Trump

6.2 Empirical Data

Molyneux, Stefan (2015-12-09) No. 3146: Donald Trump: Stop Muslim Immigration! True News, Freedomain Radio
Molyneux, Stefan (2015-12-12) No. 3149: More Anti-Donald Trump Propaganda – Rebutted!, Freedomain Radio
Molyneux, Stefan (2016-10-03) No. 3434: Why I’m Voting for Donald Trump, Freedomain Radio
Molyneux, Stefan (2016-10-18) No. 3459: The Truth about World War III, United States Vs Russia, Freedomain Radio
Molyneux, Stefan (2016-10-29) No. 3473: The Truth about America’s Survival, Demographics, and the 2016 Election, Freedomain Radio
Spencer, Richard (2015-12-09) Trump, Islam and Civilization, Radix Radio
Spencer, Richard (2015-12-19) Trump, Putin and the Future of the White World, Radix Radio
Spencer, Richard (2016-07-10) Trump, Year 1, Radix Radio
Spencer, Richard (2016-12-01) Crunch Time for Immigration Restriction, Radix Radio